

Response to 10/19/05 Office Action

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. This communication is believed to be fully responsive to the issues raised in the 10/19/05 Office Action.

#### Claim Rejections

##### §112

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for lack of antecedent basis regarding “the portion” in lines 1-2.

**Claim 23** depends from claim 20 which depends from independent claim 19. Antecedent basis for the phrase “the portion” exists in claim 19 at line two of clause two which recites “a portion”. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the §112 rejection of claim 23 be withdrawn.

##### §102

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,441,337 to Mazura et al (hereinafter “Mazura”).

**Claim 1** is directed to an electronic device and recites:

- one or more electrical components;
- a housing for containing the electrical components, the housing comprising a bottom component configured to have at least

Response to 10/19/05 Office Action

some of the electrical components positioned thereon, the bottom component joined to bottom portions of a pair of sidewalls, the bottom portions contained in a plane extending therebetween; and,

- *at least some portions of the bottom component being more proximate the plane when the electrical components are positioned thereon than in the absence of the electrical components.*

The Office suggests that Mazura describes all of the features of claim 1 at col. 4 lines 14-18. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In an attempt to further prosecution of the present application, content of a paragraph beginning at col. 4, line 14 and ending at col. 4, line 21 of the reference is provided below and recites:

The component cabinet shown in FIG. 1 is provided for the installation of structural group carriers and/or housings of electronic and optoelectronic components and their accessories, such as current suppliers, and essentially comprises a stand in the form of a frame 1 and a number of panel elements, namely side panels 2, floor panels 3, ceiling panels 4, a rear wall 5 and a door 6, and has a cabinet base 7.

The cited text is totally silent as to the claimed feature where *at least some portions of the bottom component being more proximate the plane when the electrical components are positioned thereon than in the absence of the electrical components.* Applicant has further reviewed the remainder of Mazura and found it to be equally silent as to this recited feature.

Response to 10/19/05 Office Action

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn and that claim 1 be allowed.

**Claims 2-4** depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for the reasons recited above in relation to claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections of claims 2-4 be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

**Claim 5** is directed to an electronic device housing and recites:

- a pair of sidewall components extending between respective top sidewall portions and bottom sidewall portions, the bottom sidewall portions lying in a plane that extends between the bottom sidewall portions; and,
- *a bottom component joined with and extending between the bottom sidewall portions, wherein the bottom component has a non-loaded disposition relative to the plane and a loaded disposition relative to the plane, and wherein at least a portion of the bottom component is closer to the plane in the loaded disposition than in the non-loaded disposition.*

The Office suggests that Mazura describes all of the features of claim 5 at col. 4 lines 14-67. The Office specifically suggests that the feature of “*a bottom component joined with and extending between the bottom sidewall portions, wherein the bottom component has a non-loaded disposition relative to the plane and a loaded disposition relative to the plane, and wherein at least a portion of the bottom component is closer to the plane in*

Response to 10/19/05 Office Action

*the loaded disposition than in the non-loaded disposition"* is described at col. 4 lines 14-18 of the reference. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In an attempt to further prosecution of the present application, content of a paragraph beginning at col. 4, line 14 and ending at col. 4, line 21 of the reference is provided below and recites:

The component cabinet shown in FIG. 1 is provided for the installation of structural group carriers and/or housings of electronic and optoelectronic components and their accessories, such as current suppliers, and essentially comprises a stand in the form of a frame 1 and a number of panel elements, namely side panels 2, floor panels 3, ceiling panels 4, a rear wall 5 and a door 6, and has a cabinet base 7.

The cited text is totally silent in relation to the above described feature. Applicant has further reviewed the remainder of Mazura and found it to be equally silent as to this recited feature. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn and that claim 5 be allowed.

Claims 6-12 depend from claim 5 and are allowable at least for the reasons recited above in relation to claim 5. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections of claims 6-12 be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Claim 13 is directed to an electronic device and recites:

- a base pan having a first unassembled configuration and a second assembled configuration; and,
- *a top configured to be assembled with the base pan such that at least a portion of the base pan, in the assembled*

Response to 10/19/05 Office Action

***configuration, is more upwardly disposed toward the top than in the unassembled configuration.***

The Office suggests that Mazura describes all of the features of claim 13 at col. 4 lines 14-67. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, Applicant respectfully responds that Mazura is silent at least to the feature of ***“a top configured to be assembled with the base pan such that at least a portion of the base pan, in the assembled configuration, is more upwardly disposed toward the top than in the unassembled configuration”*** as recited in claim 13. In an attempt to further prosecution of the present application, content of the reference beginning at col. 4, line 14 and ending at col. 4, line 67 is provided below and recites:

The component cabinet shown in FIG. 1 is provided for the installation of structural group carriers and/or housings of electronic and optoelectronic components and their accessories, such as current suppliers, and essentially comprises a stand in the form of a frame 1 and a number of panel elements, namely side panels 2, floor panels 3, ceiling panels 4, a rear wall 5 and a door 6, and has a cabinet base 7.

The broad, rectangular frame 1 is composed of two vertical frame legs 8 and 9, a horizontal, upper connector 10 and a likewise horizontal, lower connector 11. The two frame legs 8 and 9 and the two connectors 10 and 11 are securely connected to one another, and are made of steel sheet; all of the parts have the same U-profile with a very wide U-back and two short U-legs 13 bent upward at a right angle. Frame legs 8, 9 and connectors 10, 11 are oriented toward the inside of the frame. The U-legs 13 of the vertical frame legs 8, 9 support rows of attachment holes c disposed in a standard grid and provided for attaching the structural group carriers and the components or slide rails or component supports.

FIG. 1 shows a simplified version of a structural group carrier a disposed between the two vertical frame legs 8, 9 in the frame. Its front plate, which protrudes laterally on both sides, is screwed on with the use of rectangular attachment holes c provided on U-legs 13.

Response to 10/19/05 Office Action

Two upper, forward support arms 15 and 16, and two lower, forward support arms 17 and 18 protrude on the front side of frame 1, and two upper, rear support arms 20 and 21 and two lower, rear support arms 22, 23 protrude on rear side 19. All eight support arms 15 through 18 and 20 through 23 are attached at the corners 24 of frame 1, are parallel to one another and are disposed perpendicular to that plane of frame 1 which faces the front side 14 and the rear side 19 of the frame 1. Lower support arms 17, 18 and 22, 23 form (together with lower connector 11) cabinet base 7, and support height-adjustable screw bases 25. It is within the scope of the invention when each connector 11 or 12, together with its respective forward and rear support arms 15 through 18 or 20 through 23, is produced in one piece as a cast part having an H-shape in plan view, with the lower cast part forming cabinet base 7.

All eight support arms 15 through 18 and 20 through 23 are supports made of rectangular tubes and of equal length. They have attachment means 26 in the form of screw holes for the four side panels 2, the two floor panels 3 and the two ceiling panels 4.

The free ends of upper support arms 15 and 16 disposed on the front side 14 of the frame are connected to one another by means of an upper, forward attachment strip 27, and the free ends of lower support arms 17 and 18 are connected to one another by means of a lower, forward attachment strip 28.

The cited text is totally silent in relation to the above described feature.

Applicant has further reviewed the remainder of Mazura and found it to be equally silent as to this recited feature. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn and that claim 13 be allowed.

Claims 14-18 depend from claim 13 and are allowable at least for the reasons recited above in relation to claim 13. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections of claims 14-18 be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Claim 19 is directed to an electronic device and recites:

Response to 10/19/05 Office Action

- a base pan configured to have at least one electrical component positioned thereon; and,
- *a top component configured to be assembled with the base pan, wherein at least a portion of the base pan being configured such that assembly of the base pan and the top component causes the portion to be disposed toward the top component.*

The Office suggests that Mazura describes all of the features of claim 19 at col. 4, lines 14-67 (which is reproduced above). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, Applicant respectfully responds that Mazura is silent at least to the feature of *"a top component configured to be assembled with the base pan, wherein at least a portion of the base pan being configured such that assembly of the base pan and the top component causes the portion to be disposed toward the top component"* as recited in claim 19. Applicant has further reviewed the remainder of Mazura and found it to be equally silent as to this recited feature. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn and that claim 19 be allowed.

**Claims 20-23** depend from claim 19 and are allowable at least for the reasons recited above in relation to claim 19. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections of claims 20-23 be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

**Claim 24** is directed to an electronic device and recites:

## Response to 10/19/05 Office Action

- a base pan having an unassembled flexure disposition and an assembled flexure disposition which is different from the unassembled flexure disposition; and,
- a top component configured to be assembled with the base pan to provide the base pan into its assembled flexure disposition, wherein the assembled flexure disposition is more flexed than the unassembled flexure disposition.

The Office suggests that Mazura describes all of the features of claim 24 at col. 4 lines 14-67 (which is reproduced above). Applicant respectfully disagrees. In fact, Applicant respectfully responds that Mazura is silent in relation to both of the claimed features of claim 24. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 24 be withdrawn and that the claim be allowed.

Claim 25 depends from claim 24 and is allowable at least for the reasons recited above in relation to claim 24. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 24 be withdrawn and that the claim be allowed.

**Claim 26** is directed to a server housing and recites:

- a bottom component configured to have electrical components positioned thereon; and,
- *a first sidewall component joined with the bottom component at a first intersection and at least a second sidewall component joined with the bottom component at a second intersection,*

Response to 10/19/05 Office Action

*wherein the first and second intersections lie in a plane, and wherein a portion of the bottom component is displaced away from the plane and being configured such that positioning electric components on the bottom component will cause the portion to deflect toward the plane.*

The Office suggests that Mazura describes all of the features of claim 26 at col. 4, lines 14-67 (which is reproduced above). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully responds that Mazura is totally silent in relation to the claimed feature of *“a first sidewall component joined with the bottom component at a first intersection and at least a second sidewall component joined with the bottom component at a second intersection, wherein the first and second intersections lie in a plane, and wherein a portion of the bottom component is displaced away from the plane and being configured such that positioning electric components on the bottom component will cause the portion to deflect toward the plane”* of claim 26. The Office specifically suggests that this feature is described in relation to col. 4, lines 14-18. Applicant respectfully disagrees that the reference even contemplates this feature. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn and that the claim be allowed.


Response to 10/19/05 Office Action

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-26 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Lcc & Hayes, PLLC  
421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201

Dated: 1/18/06



Paul Mitchell  
Reg. No. 44,453  
Phone No. (509)324-9256x237